

**REMARKS**

The drawings have been objected to for failing to illustrate reference sign 60 in the drawings (Figure 4). Reference sign 60 has been deleted from the specification.

The specification has been objected to as requiring replacement of the term “wave train” with “wave train 54.” Correction has been made. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-8 have been objected to due to informalities. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended accordingly.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis. Applicant’s respectfully disagree. The limitation “the signal being subjected to reshaping” refers back to the limitation in claim 1 requiring “the signal being subjected to reshaping.”

The allowability of claims 1-8 has been withdrawn in view of the newly cited prior art. Claims 1-4, 6 and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Mabuchi. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 5, now canceled. Mabuchi fails to disclose that the signal transmission occurs by variable electromagnetic waves.

Claims 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Bjork. The rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to claim 3. The rejection to claim 5 is moot in view of its cancellation.

Bjork fails to disclose use of an antenna for transmission of a reshaped device that is transmitted by means of variable electromagnetic waves. Rather, Bjork simply uses a light emitter 20 which converts the electric sensor signal into a light signal which represents a counterpart of the electric sensor signal. The light signal is then conveyed through light waveguide 22 or optic fiber 22 onto photo detector 24.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Bjork in view of Quist. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons set forth in the arguments above, as they relate to claim 3, from which claim 7 depends.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.

**449122004000.**

Dated: May 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762